

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

## PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/B2004/002625

International filing date (day/month/year)  
21.07.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)  
23.07.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
H04L29/06

Applicant  
CANON KABUSHIKI KAISHA

**1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:**

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

**2. FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

**3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.**

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - Gitschiner Str. 103  
D-10958 Berlin  
Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0  
Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840

Authorized Officer

Nocentini, I

Telephone No. +49 30 25901-492



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITYInternational application No.  
PCT/IB2004/002625

IAP16 Rec'd PCT/PTO 01 DEC 2005

---

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ in written format
    - ☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2004/002625

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-31
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-31
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-31
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

PCT/IB2004/002625

**Re Item V.**

- 1 The following documents are referred to in this communication:  
D1 : CURBERA, DUFTLER, NAGY, KHALAF, MUKHI, WEERAWARANA:  
"Unraveling the Web Service Web" IEEE INTERNET COMPUTING, April 2002  
(2002-04), pages 86-93, XP002272683  
D2 : PAUL PORSKAMP: "D2.1.2a The PSE System Architecture for the Profiling &  
Preferences Service" GIGAMOBILE, [Online] 10 January 2002 (2002-01-10),  
pages i-31, XP002272684 Retrieved from the Internet:  
URL:https://doc.telin.nl/dscgi/ds.py/Get/F ile-19821/GM\_D212.pdf>; [retrieved  
on 2004-03-05]

**2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1**

- 2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3)PCT.

- 2.1.1 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art to the subject matter of claim 1, discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document):

A description document for a service offered by a server in a communication network (see introduction), comprising a first abstract part adapted to describe at least one message exchanged over the communication network when said service is implemented (see paragraph "Description: WDSL") and a second concrete part adapted to describe the information relating to the transmission of said messages over the communication network (see paragraph "Communication: SOAP").

- 2.1.2 The subject-matter of independent claim 1 differs from the disclosure of D1 in

that :

it comprises, in said first abstract part, a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document.

- 2.1.3 The problem to be solved by the present invention may therefore be regarded as being difficult to describe in precise term a binary multimedia.
- 2.1.4 In view of D2 the solution proposed in claim 1 of the present application cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:  
the standard MPEG7 is used together with WDSL language to describe multimedia documents (see D2, page 27, table 2).
- 2.1.5 Therefore the features disclosed in D1 and D2 would be combined by the skilled person, without exercise of any inventive skills in order to solve the problem posed. The proposed solution in independent claim 1 thus cannot be considered inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).
- 3 Since the subject-matter of each of independent claims 13, 21 corresponds to the subject matter of claim 1, the same reasoning as given for claim 1 will apply mutatis mutandis.

Therefore claims 13, 21 also do not meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

- 4 **DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-12, 14-20, 22-31**  
Dependent claims 2-12, 14-20, 22-31 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).